United Nations A/C.3/57/SR.55

General Assembly
Fifty-seventh session

Official Records

Distr.: General
12 December 2002

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 55th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Wednesday, 20 November 2002, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Wenaweser ..... (Liechtenstein)

Contents

Agenda item 104: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*)

Agenda item 105: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*)

Agenda item 106: Programme of activities of the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People (*continued*)

Agenda item 109: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

02-70291 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

Agenda item 104: Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, questions relating to refugees, returnees and displaced persons and humanitarian questions (*continued*) (A/C.3/57/L.73, L.77, L.78 and L.79)

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.73: Assistance to refugees, returnees and displaced persons in Africa

1. **Ms. G/Mariam** (Ethiopia) said that, as the main sponsor, her delegation would like to draw attention to some revisions in draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.73: in the fifteenth preambular paragraph, the words "in this regard," had been added at the end of the paragraph; in the third line of the seventeenth preambular paragraph, the words "among others," had been inserted after "aggravated"; in paragraph 19, the phrase "and other humanitarian organizations" had been deleted. In addition, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom had joined the sponsors.

2. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.73, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.77: Enlargement of the Executive Committee of the Programme of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

3. **The Chairman** said that Benin, Lebanon, Malta, Nigeria and Qatar had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

4. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.77 was adopted.*

5. **Mr. Tekin** (Turkey) said that his delegation's non-obstruction of the consensus on the draft resolution should in no way be construed as recognition of the Republic of Cyprus. The Executive Committee should not be politicized or used to further national interests.

6. **Ms. Erotokritou** (Cyprus) said that her delegation regretted that Turkey considered it appropriate to politicize the issue of the Executive Committee. Cyprus welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution and looked forward to its implementation.

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.78: Continuation of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

7. **The Chairman** said that he had been informed that draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.78 had no programme budget implications.

8. **Mr. Kebbon** (Sweden) said that Botswana, Brazil, Burundi, Dominica, Guatemala, Haiti, Mauritius, Republic of Moldova, Samoa, Togo, Uruguay and Venezuela had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

9. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.78 was adopted.*

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.79: Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

10. **Mr. Kebbon** (Sweden) said that Brazil, Lesotho, Samoa and Togo had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.79.

11. **The Chairman** said that he had been informed that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

12. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.79 was adopted.*

Agenda item 105: Promotion and protection of the rights of children (*continued*) (A/C.3/57/L.25/Rev.1 and L.72)

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.25/Rev.1: Rights of the Child

13. **Mr. de Barros** (Acting Secretary of the Committee) said that in section II, paragraph 27, of A/C.5/57/L.25/Rev.1, the General Assembly would reaffirm its decision to request the Secretary-General to conduct an in-depth study of the question of violence against children and would encourage him to appoint, as soon as possible, an independent expert to direct the study, in collaboration with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the United Nations Children's Fund and the World Health Organization. It was the understanding of the Secretariat that the activities related to the conduct of the study would be financed from extrabudgetary resources.

14. **Ms. Sereno** (Uruguay), speaking on behalf of the sponsors of the draft resolution, said that Albania, Belarus, Botswana, Cambodia, Japan, Malta, Mozambique, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Philippines,

Republic of Korea, Thailand, Uganda and Uzbekistan had joined its sponsors. She paid tribute to the close cooperation, constructive spirit and flexibility that had been demonstrated during the consultations on the text, which had allowed delegations to put the objective of consensus on the rights of children above individual interests.

15. As a result of the consultations, the following revisions had been made in the text. The twelfth preambular paragraph should read: "*Concerned also* by cases of international kidnapping of children by one of the parents,". In section II, paragraph 7 would read: "*Urges* States to address cases of international kidnapping of children by one of the parents,". In section V, the word "integrating" should be inserted after "mainstreaming" in the fifth line of paragraph 3; and the phrase "in accordance with international humanitarian law" should be added at the end of paragraph 16. In section VII, the following phrase should be inserted after the words "armed conflict" in the fourth line of paragraph (d): "taking into account the outcome document adopted by the General Assembly at its special session on children,". Lastly, she hoped that the draft resolution could, as in the past, be adopted without a vote.

16. **Ms. Barghouti** (Observer for Palestine) said that, in the light of the revisions just presented, the concerns of many delegations had been met. Therefore, the proposal contained in document A/C.3/57/L.72 was withdrawn by its sponsors.

17. **The Chairman** said that Algeria, Bahrain, Canada, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, Morocco, Nepal, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Yemen and Zambia had joined the sponsors. A recorded vote had been requested on the draft resolution.

18. **Mr. Hahn** (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the draft resolution was of utmost importance because it represented the commitment of the international community to promote and protect the rights of children. It was disappointing that the draft resolution would be put to a vote, thereby breaking the tradition of consensus on resolutions dealing with children's rights. However, one delegation had shown little flexibility and had not participated in the consultations on the draft until the latest stage. He expressed appreciation to those delegations which had shown their readiness to compromise in order to achieve consensus.

19. **Ms. Nguyen** (Canada) said that her delegation was pleased to support the draft resolution, but had been dissatisfied with the debate over the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and rights-based language. If there was one area for consensus, it should be the rights of children. The Convention on the Rights of the Child should be the primary document in that area and should stand as the benchmark for all State efforts. Canada strongly supported the International Criminal Court as an important additional mechanism to protect children's rights. Her delegation called on all States to ratify the Rome Statute as a means to end impunity for crimes against children.

20. **Mr. McCamman** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that, in countless ways, his country demonstrated daily its strong commitment to the promotion and protection of the human rights and welfare of all children. All countries, including his own, could do more in that regard, but no Member State or group of States could assert superiority in the field of children's welfare. Unfortunately, the sponsors of the draft resolution had been unwilling to address his delegation's legitimate concerns, the same concerns which had been successfully negotiated during the special session of the General Assembly on children. His country remained firmly committed to the betterment of children, but did not believe that the draft resolution contributed significantly to achieving that objective.

21. His delegation would vote against the draft resolution because of its profound disagreement on the following points. First, his country was not a party to the Convention on the Rights of the Child and did not agree on the need for its universal ratification, nor did it accept an obligation to implement its provisions. His Government did not accept it as the standard for protecting children's rights. Ultimately, decisions on becoming a party to any multilateral treaty rested with each State as a matter of sovereignty. Second, the United States acknowledged that the States Parties to the Rome Statute had begun the process of creating the International Criminal Court. His country was not a party, did not agree with the statement made about the Court in the draft resolution, and did not see the need to mention the Court in a resolution on the rights of children.

22. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.25/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, St. Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo. Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zambia.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

None.

23. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.25/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted by 164 votes to 1 with no abstentions.*

24. **Mr. Loh** Tuck Keat (Singapore) said that Singapore supported the general thrust of the draft resolution, but wished to explain its position with regard to the provision urging States Parties to "review their reservations regularly with a view to withdrawing them". The Convention on the Rights of the Child was subject to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which drew a distinction between permissible and impermissible reservations based on their compatibility with the object and purpose of a treaty. Article 19 of the Vienna Convention explicitly permitted reservations that were compatible with the object and purpose of the relevant convention. In the same vein, article 51, paragraph 2, of the Convention on the Rights of the Child only prohibited reservations that were incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. His delegation therefore felt that it was inappropriate to insist that States Parties should regularly review permissible reservations, with a view to withdrawing them.

25. The purpose of reservations was to allow as many countries as possible to become parties to international treaties at the earliest opportunity, while providing flexibility in their compliance with the obligations of the convention as required by their particular circumstances. His delegation was therefore concerned at the apparent trend to discourage reservations, which was counter-productive and would discourage countries from becoming party to international treaties. The position just stated applied to all such resolutions on the issue of permissible reservations.

26. **Ms. Barghouti** (Observer for Palestine) said that the adoption of the draft resolution sent a strong message to every child in the world that the international community was committed to their welfare, access to education and health. The understanding of the sponsors of the proposal contained in A/C.3/57/L.72 had been that children in armed conflict included children under foreign occupation.

27. **Mr. Koren** (Israel) said that it was the understanding of his delegation that the provision also included children under the threat of terrorism.

28. **The Chairman** proposed that the Committee should take note of the report of the Committee on the Rights of the Child (A/57/41 and Corr.1) and the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the Convention on the Rights of the Child (A/57/295).

29. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 106: Programme of activities of the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People (*continued*) (A/C.3/57/L.29/Rev.1)

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.29/Rev.1: Indigenous people and issues

30. **The Chairman** said that he had been informed that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications and announced that the delegation of Jamaica wished to join the sponsors.

31. **Mr. de Barros** (Acting Secretary of the Committee), said that two corrections had been made in the final paragraph of the draft resolution: in the last line, the word "through" had been inserted following the word "including" and the words "an adviser or advisers" had been replaced with "adviser(s)".

32. **Ms. Loemban Tobing-Klein** (Suriname) said the draft resolution was an important step forward in ensuring respect for the rights of indigenous peoples and recalled that development projects must include an assessment of their impact on indigenous peoples. The sponsors' intention in the final, operative paragraph was not to undermine the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues, but rather to provide it with every assistance possible in carrying out its mandate. She hoped that the text would be adopted without a vote.

33. **Mr. Gregoire** (Dominica) also stressed the draft resolution's importance to the indigenous peoples of the world and regretted that it had been necessary to introduce a revised version of the original. His delegation was concerned that there had been relatively few positive outcomes to the Decade of the World's Indigenous People. Lastly he hoped that the adoption of the draft resolution would signify a renewed commitment on the part of the international community to real progress in the remaining years of the Decade and that it would be adopted without a vote.

34. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.29/Rev.1, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

35. **The Chairman** suggested that the Committee should decide to recommend to the General Assembly that it take note of the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations (A/57/296).

36. *It was so decided.*

37. **The Chairman** said that the Committee had thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 106.

Agenda item 109: Human rights questions (*continued*)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*) (A/C.3/57/L.44, A/C.3/57/L.55, A/C.3/57/L.56/Rev.1, A/C.3/57/L.67, A/C.3/57/L.68, A/C.3/57/L.86, A/C.3/57/L.87)

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.44: Globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of all human rights

38. **The Chairman** said that he had been informed that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications and announced that the delegations of Indonesia, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi and Nigeria wished to join the sponsors.

39. **Mr. Hahn** (Denmark), speaking on behalf of the European Union in explanation of vote before the voting, said the European Union was not convinced that globalization had an impact on all human rights, for example the right of freedom of speech, or that the interdependence and indivisibility of all human rights meant that violation of one implied violation of all. It did however recognize that globalization could have consequences for human rights both positive and, potentially, negative.

40. It was regrettable that the text emphasized the negative aspects of globalization rather than the opportunities that it offered, in particular to promote human rights through information and communicating technology, did not adequately reflect the complexity of globalization and falsely linked globalization with increased poverty. Globalization would lead to increased growth and prosperity although its benefits were not yet shared equally. The issues discussed in the draft resolution were integrated into the work of existing resolutions and mechanisms, such as the

Working Group on the Right to Development. The European Union would continue to discuss globalization in the appropriate forums and would vote against draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.44.

41. **Mr. von Kaufmann** (Canada), speaking also on behalf of Australia, New Zealand and the United States, said that he was mindful of the need for all to share in the benefits of globalization, which both provided opportunities and posed challenges. Governments had a key role to play in promoting financial, economic, and social stability, and defending human rights at the national and international levels, in order to ensure that globalization had a positive impact. The draft resolution did not recognize the complexity of the globalization process, including both its benefits and the need for domestic measures to meet the challenges of globalization. He regretted the lack of transparency with which the text of the draft resolution had been brought forward, including the lack of informal consultations and, accordingly, would vote against it.

42. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Singapore, Turkey.

43. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.44 was adopted by 105 votes to 49, with 8 abstentions.*

44. **Mr. Roshdy** (Egypt) said that he hoped a consensus would be possible on the draft resolution in 2003. His delegation believed that globalization had both good and bad aspects and that the globalization process must take into account the interests of the developing countries. With regard to the lack of transparency during consultations mentioned by the representative of Canada, he noted that consultations had been announced in the Journal and that unfortunately the delegation of Canada had not been represented.

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.55: Promotion of a democratic and equitable international order

45. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that the draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

46. **Mr. Fanego** (Cuba) said the delegations of Ecuador, Egypt and Pakistan wished to join the sponsors. He recalled the responsibility of both States and the international community as a whole to ensure full and equal enjoyment of human rights and the duty of all States to ensure that the peoples of the world shared in the benefits of development without discrimination.

47. **Ms. Eskjaer** (Denmark), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting on behalf of the European Union, the associated countries Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Turkey, and, in addition, Iceland, said that the European Union supported the establishment of an equitable international economic order and recognized that some of the issues raised in the draft resolution were important.

48. Several elements in the draft were, however, an attempt to have the Third Committee examine texts originating in other functional commissions of the Organization, removing them from their proper context. The draft resolution also underlined the international community's obligation to control the mechanisms of globalization but omitted the duties and obligations of States in that regard, a consideration to which the European Union attached great importance. The Third Committee was not the appropriate forum to address the issues raised in the draft resolution, and the European Union would therefore vote against it.

49. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Samoa, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yugoslavia.

Abstaining:

Argentina, Fiji, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Mexico, Panama, Peru, South Africa.

50. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.55 was adopted by 98 votes to 52, with 8 abstentions.*

Amendments to draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.56/Rev.1: Extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions (contained in documents A/C.3/57/L.86 and L.87)

51. **Ms. Ahmed** (Sudan), speaking on behalf of the member countries of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, introduced the amendments contained in document A/C.3/57/L.87. The killings dealt with in paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.56/Rev.1 did not fall within the category of extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, since they were perpetrated by individuals rather than States. Reference to such situations gave States an opportunity to divert attention away from their own actions and towards crimes committed by individuals. The corresponding amendment would rule out that opportunity and strengthen the collective resolve to prevent executions.

52. During the discussion of the report of the Special Rapporteur, many delegations had expressed their view that the Special Rapporteur had gone beyond her mandate in preparing the report. The members of the Organization of the Islamic Conference were prepared to take note of the report, provided that paragraph 11 of the draft resolution also highlighted the need for reports to remain within the mandate of the Special Rapporteur. The amendments to paragraph 12 sought to provide a comprehensive description of the mandate of

the Special Rapporteur, with a view to avoiding similar contentious debates in future.

53. **Mr. Roshdy** (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the original sponsors as well as the Syrian Arab Republic, introduced the amendments contained in document A/C.3/57/L.86. The draft resolution was designed to prevent extrajudicial executions, not to condemn the use of the death penalty. The amendment to paragraph 18 made it clear that the intention was to prevent wrongful executions wherever they occurred, irrespective of whether the State in question had abolished the death penalty. It was vital that such an important resolution should apply equally to all States. The amendment to paragraph 22 simply reiterated the need for the Special Rapporteur to submit a report within her mandate.

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.67: Situation of human rights in Cambodia

54. **The Chairman** announced that Canada, Liechtenstein and Norway had become sponsors of the draft resolution, and that it had no programme budget implications.

55. **Ms. Sakai** (Japan), speaking as the main sponsor of the draft resolution, said that Andorra was no longer one of the sponsors, but that they had been joined by the delegation of New Zealand. She made two minor corrections in the text.

56. **Mr. Al-Eryani** (Yemen) said that the Commission on Human Rights was manipulated by countries intent on furthering their own political objectives. While some States were singled out for condemnation, others were allowed to continue to commit gross human rights violations, such as those occurring in the occupied Palestinian territories. Consequently, his delegation would abstain from voting on any human rights issue.

57. *Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.67, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

58. **Ms. Thong** Sokuntheary (Cambodia) said that her delegation had joined the consensus in the spirit of cooperation, but with some reluctance owing to concerns over some elements of the draft. In view of the indivisibility of all human rights, the promotion and protection of those rights should be seen as an ongoing process. The best way to continue that process was through partnership and constructive cooperation.

Draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.68: The right to food

59. **The Chairman** announced that the delegations of Andorra, Austria, Bulgaria, Congo, Finland, Mauritania, Nepal, Norway, Panama, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia and Somalia had joined the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.3/57/L.68, and that it contained no programme budget implications.

60. **Mr. de Barros** (Acting Secretary of the Committee) read out the revised version of paragraph 14, introduced earlier, on behalf of the sponsors, by the representative of Cuba.

61. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the original sponsors as well as Iceland and Switzerland, said that the draft resolution was sponsored by a total of 95 delegations, which demonstrated the widespread acceptance of the right to food. The draft resolution had emerged from consensus-building negotiations over the previous two weeks, taking into account the various positions expressed. However, some amendments had been proposed in an attempt to change the fundamental aim of the resolution. The sponsors were not prepared to negotiate on the basic principle of the right to food, so he urged delegations to support the agreed text of the draft resolution.

62. **Mr. Winnick** (United States of America) said that he wished to propose two amendments with a view to bringing the draft resolution into conformity with the Declaration of the World Food Summit: Five Years Later, in which the international community set out plans to halve the number of undernourished people in the world by 2015. He proposed that, in paragraph 5, the phrase "progressively the full realization of the right to food" should be replaced by the words "progressive realization of the right to adequate food" and, in paragraph 8, the word "progressive" should be inserted before "realization" and the word "adequate" before "food".

63. His country intended to participate fully in the elaboration of guidelines to achieve the progressive realization of the right to adequate food, in accordance with paragraph 10 of the Declaration. The proposed amendments did not alter the fundamental aim of the draft resolution, but were merely intended to ensure consistency with the language of the declaration. His delegation was prepared to join the consensus, provided its amendments were accepted.

64. **Mr. Amorós Núñez** (Cuba), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that the amendments proposed by the United States were unacceptable. While he appreciated the attempt to seek consensus, the amendments detracted from the fundamental commitment to guarantee the right to food. Moreover, they had been submitted too late for proper consideration by other delegations. He therefore urged the Committee not to take them into account.

The meeting rose at 1.00 p.m.